

a labor press service

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 4, No. 1

February 4, 1966

In this issue

	Page
Senator Morse Brands U.S. as "International Outlaw".....	1
The Realities Behind Johnson's "Peace Offensive".....	4
Moroccan Student Leader Tortured by Police.....	7
Evidence Mounts that Aidit Was Killed.....	8
Famine in India.....	9
Political Status Demanded for 11 Algerian Prisoners.....	10
Ben Bella Reported Still Alive.....	10
Wives of Peruvian Guerrilla Fighters Held as Hostages.....	11
Conflicting Reports on Lobaton.....	11
Dissemination of Nuclear Arms in Spain.....	12
Ben Barka Was Cast for Leading Role at Havana Conference.....	14
Scandal Grows in Ben Barka Case -- by George Saunders.....	15
Avowed Trotskyist Among Defendants in Warsaw Court.....	16
Relative Quiescence on Witch-Hunt Front in U.S. -- by George Novack.....	18
Nkrumah's Book Angers State Department.....	21
The Situation in Latin America.....	21
Sneevliet -- Marxist Missionary in Indonesia -- by Jan Hekkenberg.....	24
The Example of Cuba -- by Bertrand Russell.....	30

## SENATOR MORSE BRANDS U.S. AS "INTERNATIONAL OUTLAW"

During a nationwide CBS television debate with four other colleagues, Democratic Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon made a blistering attack January 30 on administration foreign policy that is bound to reverberate through the country in the debate at this critical turn in the Vietnam war. Morse declared that the American people were being denied the facts about the war as the German people were denied the facts

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N.Y. 10010

under Hitler. He said that the U.S. is "the major aggressor" and an "international outlaw" without "a scintilla of international right" in conducting its "unilateral war."

He challenged Johnson to make public a series of documents on the Southeast Asian situation locked in the safe of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"Let the administration tell us what they've been doing in Thailand," he went on. Thailand is the site of naval and air bases from which air strikes on north Vietnam have been launched.

Morse disclosed that the senatorial delegation he headed was briefed in Hong Kong and told that further escalation would leave China no alternative but to come into the conflict. He intimated that this would be welcomed by some "preventive warriors" in the Pentagon.

He stated that no major country in Asia supported the U.S. war and that other nations merely gave lip service to it. He pointed to the secret Mansfield report which concluded that if the United States did not settle the affair by negotiation, the alternative prospect was "a continuation of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland."

The president ought to request Congress for a declaration of war, Morse said, "if he wants to take hundreds of thousands of American boys to their death." The administration refuses to make this request, Morse explained, because it knows that the U.S. couldn't enforce a declaration of war. Its own allies, for example, would not discontinue shipments to north Vietnam. Furthermore, if bombs were dropped on Hanoi and Haiphong, Russians might be killed and Russian ships sunk which would bring the USSR directly into the conflict.

Morse reported that he was among a group of congressmen who visited the Russian ambassador. Morse asked what the reaction of the Soviet Union would be if the United States should bomb the nuclear installations of the Chinese. The Russian ambassador responded, said Morse, by asking him if he could give the date when this would occur. The implication, from the context in which Morse put it, was that if the United States attacks China, the Soviet Union would have no choice but to back its Chinese ally to the hilt. This would signify the beginning of World War III.

Morse agreed with his fellow senators that the U.S. can't get out of Vietnam. He wants to halt the projected escalation and bring other nations in by referring the issue to the U.N. Security Council for "arbitration." He would prefer to have Asia policed by an international force rather than by the United States alone.

"Do we move forward or do we move out?" asked Republican

Senator Mundt. Speaking for the administration, Democratic Senators Boggs and Stennis, both from the South, asserted that this was no time to talk of "running out." The U.S., they argued, must go ahead with full force to win.

We must meet the threat of "Asiatic Communism," proclaimed Stennis. Unless the United States takes a firm stand now, weakness will invite additional uprisings in Latin America, Africa... even in Europe.

Boggs compared Vietnam with Greece and Turkey at the end of "World War II." Just as Washington stood firm there and "in Berlin and Cuba" against the Soviet Union, so it must now stand against China.

Morse announced that he would introduce a resolution to test the President's power to conduct "an undeclared and illegal war." Johnson seeks legal sanction for his escalation in the congressional resolution passed in August 1964 at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident. He and his supporters claim that this was the equivalent of a declaration of war and gives him authority for whatever action he wants to undertake in Southeast Asia.

This is being contested by Chairman Fulbright and other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who resist deepening intervention in Vietnam. One of them, Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, who was on the television panel, told Secretary of State Rusk January 28: "Personally, I'm scared to death that we are on the way to World War III."

This high-level debate over foreign policy which the administration has been trying to avoid, has been precipitated by similar apprehensions among the American people about the administration's course. Morse took cognizance of this when he made a direct appeal to the American people not to trust the commander in chief but to stop the headlong plunge toward disaster by making known their opposition to his foreign policy.

Some of Johnson's top advisers have said that the war could go on for at least six to seven years. In an article on "the awesome twosome," the president and Defense Secretary McNamara, Tom Wicker, New York Times Washington correspondent, wrote on January 30 that Vietnam is "the one major problem they have yet to solve and the one that may yet prove their downfall."

The point is to prevent the rest of humanity from going down with them.

The way to block that is not by substituting the intervention of the U.N. Security Council for that of the United States, as Morse proposes, but by insisting on the withdrawal of American troops so that the Vietnamese will be free to decide their own fate.

Wide "Credibility Gap" Still There

THE REALITIES BEHIND JOHNSON'S "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

A year after the first air raids were launched over north Vietnam, Johnson is set to cut short his month-long pause and renew the bombings. Calculating that it has squeezed the maximum propaganda and diplomatic benefits out of its phony "peace offensive," the administration can now go ahead with the stepped-up military offensive it has been preparing.

General Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has just outlined the central concepts behind the strategy of the Washington war makers. He told a congressional hearing January 22 that "Our objective out there is to defeat, together with the Vietnamese forces, the main-force Vietcong units and the North Vietnamese forces that have been introduced."

To justify the administration's request for a \$12,300,000,000 supplementary military appropriation, he elaborated on this policy in testimony given before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Wheeler stated that he particularly wanted to declare that in south Vietnam the United States was facing "the first of the wars of national liberation which have been preached by the Soviets and by Mao Tse-tung, and there is a very important stake here resting upon whether we win or lose."

"I believe," he went on, "that if we lose this war, which we do not have to lose, that we will have more wars of national liberation to face up to with the prospect of greater losses under less favorable circumstances."

This military spokesman has the virtue of being blunt and going to the point. Unlike Johnson, Humphrey and Rusk, who must keep public sensibilities in mind, the head of the general staff uttered few decorative phrases about freedom, democracy and the self-determination of small nations; he emphasized instead the real objectives of the White House and the Pentagon.

Some 197,000 troops have been sent to south Vietnam and many more are on the way because Johnson and his circle believe large-scale actions are required to stop the spread of the colonial liberation struggle and its development along socialist lines, to contain the influence of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and to prevent any unfavorable changes in the balance of forces in the global contest between the imperialist and anti-imperialist camps.

The president and his Pentagon strategists are resolved to stay and have their conscript army fight for years in that sector of Southeast Asia because they believe it offers the most advan-

tageous opportunity to deliver crushing blows to the class opponents arrayed against them. Having drawn a line at the seventeenth parallel, they will not permit that artificial boundary to be overstepped or pushed back. It is to be as inviolate as similar dividing lines in Korea and Berlin. And the military leaders of the U.S. ruling class are ready to enlarge the conflict and risk war with China to secure these objectives.

There are sharp disagreements in high military circles over the best way to handle the Vietnam problem. Retired General Gavin, an army planning chief in 1954 when Eisenhower decided against landing U.S. troops in Vietnam to save the French imperialist forces, has urged ending the bombings of north Vietnam and withdrawing U.S. troops to coastal enclaves while mounting a sustained diplomatic effort in the United Nations to end the war.

General Gavin has been seconded by retired General Matthew Ridgway, former U.S. Army chief of staff, who negotiated the Korean truce and blocked intervention in Vietnam in 1954. These former officers undoubtedly expound views which their confreres in active service cannot make public.

Wheeler speaks for the predominant faction in the Pentagon and Congress who want to resume bombing north Vietnam and continue escalating the conflict without further delay. He argued specifically against Gavin's more cautious tactical prescriptions.

The administration is moving along Wheeler's line. Defense Secretary McNamara told the senate committee that his department's present planning was based on the premise that combat operations in Vietnam would continue at least through June 1967. The committee chairman later revealed that American forces this year would build up to 400,000 to 500,000 men. This will be a bigger commitment than the peak of 407,000 in the Korean War. The 1967 budget which Johnson sent to Congress contains record military expenditures, including \$10,000,000,000 for the war in Vietnam.

Intending to be overheard by Moscow and Peking, McNamara informed the House Armed Services Committee that the U.S. is planning enough missile capacity to soon ensure the simultaneous destruction of both the USSR and China!

These are the grim realities behind the Johnson "peace offensive" which now appears in its true light as a maneuver designed to prepare the way for stepped-up ground and air operations in Southeast Asia. It was not meant to set the stage, as so many hoped, for opening negotiations with either Hanoi or the National Front for Liberation (short of their utter capitulation).

Its main aim was to close up the "credibility gap" which had been causing difficulties for the administration in its relations with the American people and the rest of the world. Many friendly foreign governments and citizens at home were rightly

dubious about the president's glib assurances that he was willing to go from the battlefield to the conference table. The temporary curtailment of air attacks over north Vietnam (while saturation bombings in the south continued), and the highly publicized visits of envoys to foreign capitals, were initiated to allay these suspicions, shift the onus of continuing the conflict to the other side, and clear the decks for the next steps in extending the war.

Johnson believes he has succeeded in extricating himself from a tight corner and improving his diplomatic position. A Washington dispatch in the January 25 New York Times registered the president's opinion "that the recent peace offensive and the current pause in the bombing of north Vietnam have given him a higher degree of flexibility and a greater freedom from military and diplomatic pressures than he has had since the bombing began last February."

Despite Johnson's relief, he continues to confront heavy opposition to an expansion of the war. Differences with his Vietnam policy and alternatives to it are being projected, not only by military men, but by leading congressmen and members of his own party who are hearing from their constituents, from foreign powers, from newspapers such as the New York Times and the Herald Tribune and from the clergy, in addition to the more intransigent antiwar sentiments voiced by the students and intellectuals.

Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declares that he has never seen "any issue of significance which caused such uncertainty and questioning of policy." He and Senator Mansfield, the Democratic majority leader, have urged a continuation of the bombing pause. Mansfield, who has just come back from Vietnam, wants it suspended "indefinitely."

Fulbright has joined U.N. Secretary General U Thant in advocating that the National Front for Liberation be invited to participate in any peace parley to remove that obstacle to negotiations. Secretary Rusk replied testily that "if the Vietcong come to the conference table as full partners, they will in a sense have been victorious in the very aims that south Vietnam and the United States are pledged to prevent."

An Associated Press survey of senatorial views on whether or not to renew the bombing showed that the fifty senators who took positions on the issue were divided evenly. A group of senators from both the Democratic and Republican parties who visited Fulbright January 26 expressed the view that the president was being unduly influenced by advisers "already deeply committed to a course of action which has been unsuccessful in achieving its objectives in the past and threatens disaster in the future."

Fifteen Democratic senators asked Johnson on January 27 to extend the bombing pause.

Such a cascade of openly pronounced differences at the highest levels with the policy of an administration engaged in waging a foreign war is without precedent in the American history of this century. It is symptomatic of the perplexity and disquiet both in the ruling circles and among the people over the correctness of Johnson's course. There are widespread fears of the costs and consequences of widening the war.

This situation opens new perspectives for broadening and deepening mass opposition to the war itself. Johnson's halting of the bombings also served to halt the momentum of the antiwar movement. It has slowed down temporarily owing to the false expectations aroused by the "peace offensive." These illusions will be dissipated as Washington goes ahead with its war plans in Southeast Asia.

The experience of this episode should strengthen the militants who have been insisting, against the moderate elements led by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the Communist party, that the central task of the movement is not to back up Johnson's fraudulent propaganda around negotiations but to mount a campaign for immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops.

These forces are now concentrating on building big mass demonstrations throughout the country during the international days of protest against U.S. intervention in Vietnam scheduled for March 25-26.

#### MOROCCAN STUDENT LEADER TORTURED BY POLICE

Despite the sensational and highly damaging publicity surrounding its sinister role in the kidnapping and possible murder of Ben Barka, the Moroccan government is continuing its repressive moves against the left as can be judged from the following report issued in Paris January 26 by the UNEM (Union Nationale des Etudiants du Maroc):

\* \* \*

"During the night last Monday, the Moroccan police arrested our comrade, Hassen Ismail, vice-president of the National Union of Students of Morocco. After having been tortured by the Moroccan police in Rabat, Hassen Ismail was sentenced yesterday by the Rabat court to six months in prison.

"The Moroccan students in France energetically protest against this new severe sentence which, through one of our national officials, seeks to deal another blow against the National Union of Students of Morocco, and which again shows that the kidnapping of Brother Ben Barka was the signal for a new wave of repression aimed at the progressive Moroccan forces as a whole.

"The National Union of Students of Morocco yesterday called a general strike which was observed one hundred per cent in all the university centers, Rabat, Casablanca and Fez, among all the big schools and faculties, to demonstrate once again the indignation of the Moroccan students over the police politics of the Moroccan government."

EVIDENCE MOUNTS THAT AIDIT WAS KILLED

In the vast witch-hunt that has swept Indonesia -- perhaps the bloodiest nationwide purge of political dissidents since the time of Hitler -- the fate of the leaders of the Communist party still remains unclear although the evidence is mounting that many of them lost their lives before the firing squads of the generals now in control of the government.

In the case of D.N. Aidit, the head of the party, for instance, it is still not known positively whether he is alive or dead but various sources report that he was shot.

Diplomatic channels in London have affirmed that Aidit was one of the victims of the purge in which as many as 150,000 persons have been butchered.

Reuters reported that the January 17 issue of the Christian newspaper Sinar Harapan of Djakarta published a photo showing Aidit surrounded by troops. The accompanying story said that Aidit had been captured at Solo on November 21.

The British Guardian published extracts from a letter received from Indonesia stating that Aidit was killed in November near Solo.

Before his death, Aidit reportedly wrote two letters to Sukarno appealing to the president to stop the slaughter of Communists.

Sukarno is said to have replied that he would do everything possible, adding: "I need time and I must first of all change the state of mind of the heads of the army."

The same letter received by the Guardian said that Njoto, the second vice-president of the Communist party, had been killed. Imprisoned in Djakarta, he was interrogated for two days. After finally being returned to his cell, he never reappeared.

Under Aidit's leadership, the Communist party of Indonesia -- one of the largest in the world -- followed the fatal policy of relying on Sukarno, the representative of the "nationalist bourgeoisie," instead of pursuing an independent course.

Aidit boasted on more than one occasion of the cleverness



of his policy and jeered at those who called it revisionist. He was bolstered in this not only by Moscow but by Peking, the Mao leadership having its own reasons for wanting to cover up his opportunism.

Aidit's policies paved the way for one of the greatest disasters ever experienced by a Communist party. And Aidit himself seems to have been caught so unawares by the consequences of his course, that he could not make good his own escape. In this he was less fortunate than the Communist party leaders in Spain in the thirties who helped open the road for Franco's victory.

FAMINE IN INDIA

A government spokesman in New Delhi revealed January 21 that 12,000,000 persons in India are living "in great distress" because of hunger. The government spokesman added that they are "threatened" with famine. In India, it appears, "famine" has only an absolute meaning -- at least as viewed through the eyes of a government bureaucrat.

Those who are experiencing "great distress" because of the lightness of their diet are to be assembled in "rescue camps" and given emergency rations.

Besides the 12,000,000 in "great distress," another 100,000,000 are suffering from "undernourishment," according to the same official source. The spokesman failed to indicate how the line between "great distress" and "undernourishment" is determined. In any case, there appear to be no plans to assemble the 100,000,000 persons into "rescue camps" where emergency rations can be handed out.

It is reported that the U.S. government has agreed to release some of its mountainous reserves of surplus food for use in India. The shipments, however, may well turn out to be too little and too late.

After all, Johnson's main concern at the moment is not the plight of India's teeming millions, who are all safely enclosed in the "free world"; he is "agonizing" over how to get \$12,300,000,000 from Congress to step up the mass slaughter of Asians in and around Vietnam who have somehow got the strange idea that maybe communism is preferable to capitalism.

DEATH SENTENCES FOR 13 CP LEADERS IN IRAN

The daily Teheran newspapers published a short notice January 24 announcing that a military court had sentenced fourteen leaders of the Tudeh (Communist) party although they were not

present at the trial.

Fortunately for the defendants, all of them are abroad and have been since 1949. In that year they escaped from prison where they had been thrown because of their political views.

The fourteen leaders are living in exile in the Soviet Union, East Germany, France and Algeria.

The trial procedure as well as the sentences confirmed once again that the shah's pretense at being liberal in his political views has no connection with the reality in Iran.

### POLITICAL STATUS DEMANDED FOR 11 ALGERIAN PRISONERS

The Committee for the Defense of Ahmed Ben Bella and Other Victims of the Repression in Algeria called attention in a press release January 15 to the "particularly alarming situation" in which eleven well-known figures are being held in prison at Lambese. The eleven are Ahmed Abbad, Marcel Gex, Bachir Hadj Ali, Omar Haraig, Mohamed Harbi, Ahmed Lamoudi, Kellal Lounes, Jacques Salort, William Sportisse, Hocine Zahouane and Henri Zannetacci.

"These eleven prisoners," reports the committee, "are being held under completely arbitrary conditions. Not having been formally charged, they still remain in the custody of the military authorities. It is impossible for them to see their relatives, to communicate with their lawyers or to be examined by their doctors...

"Some of these men, of whom it is known that they have been cruelly tortured for a long time, are in worse condition than before their incarceration.

"In conclusion, the committee strongly appeals for the right of these defendants to be immediately granted the status of political prisoners and to be allowed to receive all the attention which their state of health requires."

### BEN BELLA REPORTED STILL ALIVE

One of Ben Bella's lawyers, Lafue-Veron, learned January 15 through a telephone call to the former Algerian president's family that the victim of Boumedienne's coup d'etat last June is still alive.

Mme Myriem Ben Bella, a niece of the prisoner, recently received a letter from Ben Bella in which he mentioned that his health was good and that he is permitted to have books.

This is the second letter known to have been received by anyone from Ben Bella. Last November Ben Bella's mother said she

had received word from him. This was the first positive indication that he was alive.

Boumedienne has barred Ben Bella from receiving visits by his lawyers, his doctors or his friends. The real conditions of his imprisonment are thus unknown.

### WIVES OF PERUVIAN GUERRILLA FIGHTERS HELD AS HOSTAGES

(The following is a translation of an article that appeared in the January 21 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.)

\* \* \*

We have received from Peru a letter signed by six wives of revolutionists imprisoned after their husbands joined the guerrilla movement: Carmen Galvez de Gadea, Mercedes de Fernandez Gasco, Guillermina Vidal, Jacqueline Eluau de Lobaton, Carmen de Velando and Nelly Arias. Imprisoned for about five months, these six women denounce the "policy of taking hostages" of which they have been made victims. Accused of having plotted against the security of the state, no precise charge has been lodged against them. Five of the women have children.

These political prisoners add that Mrs. Carmela de la Puente could not sign the letter because she has been confined in a Peruvian clinic where she again went on a hunger strike. Her husband, Luis de la Puente, was killed last October during a skirmish with the regular army. Secretary general of the MIR (Movement of the Revolutionary Left), he was leading a guerrilla struggle in the Cuzco region.

### CONFLICTING REPORTS ON LOBATON

The Lima press reported that six guerrilla fighters were killed December 15 by the Peruvian armed forces. Among the six was Guillermo Lobaton, leader of one of the guerrilla fronts.

Like Luis de la Puente Uceda, whose death at the hands of government troops has been confirmed, Lobaton has often been described as a "Trotskyist." Actually, he is one of the main leaders -- like de la Puente -- of the MIR (Movement of the Revolutionary Left) which has worked in a friendly way with the Trotskyists led by Hugo Blanco but which has important differences with the Trotskyist movement, particularly over tactics.

Well-informed sources in Peru have denied the report about Lobaton's death and say that he is continuing the guerrilla struggle. With the death of de la Puente, Lobaton is now considered to be one of the most influential leaders of the MIR.

DISSEMINATION OF NUCLEAR ARMS IN SPAIN

One of the proclaimed aims of the Johnson administration, as of the preceding administrations since the time of Harry Truman, is to block the further dissemination of nuclear arms. The Pentagon has a surfeit of them. Enough, according to scientists who have gone into the problem, to wipe out mankind 50 to 75 times over.

The White House can't do anything about the Soviet stockpile, which was accumulated without permission from Washington. Great Britain has a few of the devices and de Gaulle is busily accumulating his own force de frappe. But no more powers ought to have them, Johnson maintains (except Canada which has been given a supply and West Germany which has been made into a nuclear warehouse). Johnson is particularly irked about China following the Soviet example and going into nuclear production without permission from the Pentagon. He would like a rollback there; and so Washington has stepped up the propaganda about no more dissemination.

On January 17, however, Spain unexpectedly received a supply of nuclear weapons -- four, according to the first rumors. A B-52 of the Strategic Air Command collided with a KC-135 aerial tanker while taking on fuel over Almeria, the two planes crashing near Cuevas del Almanzora, a town of 10,000 inhabitants.

The B-52 was part of the big fleet, armed with H-bombs, kept constantly in the air by the Pentagon to guard the "free world" from the "threat of Communism," a threat that is particularly grave in such bastions of freedom as the one ruled by the fascist dictator Franco.

More than 1,000 American military personnel and Spanish soldiers immediately went into action in accordance with Johnson's principle of doing everything possible to block further dissemination of nuclear arms. They combed the countryside while navy vessels swept the nearby Mediterranean.

Spokesmen of the Pentagon had only "no comment" to inquiries about whether four bombs had actually been disseminated in the crash. They admitted only that the B-52 had been carrying "nuclear armament." They added reassuringly that a "radiological study" had shown there was "no danger whatsoever to the public health and safety."

This was good to hear in view of the fact that B-52's are said to be able to carry nine tons of thermonuclear bombs, two of the devices reaching 25 megatons capacity each. (One megaton = 1,000,000 tons of dynamite. By way of comparison, the bomb that Truman ordered dropped on Hiroshima was equivalent to 20,000 tons of dynamite.)

Rumor had it that three bombs were recovered from the Mediterranean by frogmen. What about the fourth bomb? There was some mystery to this. Military personnel were deployed over the country-

side with Geiger counters. Peasants were warned not to eat any of their ripening vegetables or other crops, particularly not to drink milk from their cows.

The Spanish authorities announced January 21 that all the inhabitants of the three towns of Garrucha, Vera and Cuevas del Almanzora were being submitted to medical examination. Already, they reported, two civil guards had been found showing traces of radioactivity.

The editor of the Paris daily Le Monde (January 23-24) observed:

"Despite the assurances given last Thursday by the American army air staff in Spain, according to which there is no risk of contamination whatsoever, it can be assumed that the protective shield of one of the bombs cracked open when it came down, permitting some material to escape."

In brief, the shell of one of the nuclear eggs couldn't take the impact, and the area was doused with the radioactive charge.

Still another version was provided by unnamed "official Spanish spokesmen." According to the January 27 Le Monde, they revealed that only two 25-megaton nuclear bombs were on board the B-52. "When the collision occurred with the tanker plane, the B-52 pilot ejected the two bombs before parachuting down himself. The bombs presumably came down slowly on their parachutes and sank into the sea near two Spanish fishing boats, who rescued the pilot and two other members of the crew."

The two H-bombs, according to this version, are now lying in water 900 to 1,200 feet deep. "Some maritime experts are of the opinion that only a bathyscaphe will be able to reach this depth, but this solution appears at the moment to still face some technical difficulties."

As for the radioactive contamination in the area of the three Spanish towns, the unnamed authorities said nothing. Le Monde reports that only attachments belonging to the two 25-megaton bombs were found in the 1,000-man search that went on for ten days. These, Le Monde deduces, could have belonged to the "atomic detonators."

The detonator of an H-bomb, it should be noted, is not a mere mechanical device like the trigger of a Colt six-shooter. It is an atom bomb of the size used over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The dissemination of the materials in the two 25-megaton H-bomb detonators would thus explain the measures taken in the affected area to seal off radioactive contamination.

In Cuevas del Almanzora, as the mass medical examination proceeded, some fifty persons, braving the frowns of the Caudillo and his ally Johnson, marched in a picket line, shouting, "Down with the Americans and their bombs!"

BEN BARKA WAS CAST FOR LEADING ROLE AT HAVANA CONFERENCE

In seeking a motive for the kidnapping (and most likely murder) of Mehdi Ben Barka in Paris October 29, the bourgeois press has persistently advanced the hypothesis that the revolutionary leader was preparing to make his peace with Morocco's tyrant King Hassan II and that ultraright political forces, such as those represented by Interior Minister Mohammed Oufkir, sought to block this. The press is completely silent about a different possible motive.

Ben Barka was president of the International Preparatory Committee for the Tricontinental Conference recently held in Havana. With Boumedienne's seizure of power in Algeria through a coup d'etat last June, the imprisonment of Ben Bella and the resulting shift of the government to the right, Ben Barka's position as a leading North African revolutionist assumed new importance. He would undoubtedly have played a big role at the Tricontinental Conference. To remove Ben Barka from the scene thus signified a blow against the Havana meeting, a blow which a number of reactionary forces, including the CIA, would most certainly favor.

Ben Barka visited Cuba during the preparations for the conference. While there he spoke strongly for an overall strategy among revolutionists on a tricontinental scale.

"We must achieve greater coordination in the struggle of all the peoples, as the problems in Vietnam, the Congo and the Dominican Republic stem from the same source: U.S. imperialism," he said.

The International Preparatory Committee selected the various organizations entitled to have accredited delegates at the conference. Where various organizations existed, a National Front was set up. "This will lead to a greater unity among the anti-imperialist forces of each country, initiating a positive process among organizations in which at times there are secondary differences, in the face of an enemy that wants to be an international gendarme. This is the spirit in which the conference will meet in Havana."

Ben Barka was optimistic about the outcome of the conference. "We are certain that this conference will be a success and that its repercussions will be felt in the three continents, especially in Latin America. At the same time, it will be an opportunity to honor the heroic Cuban people, and the clear-sightedness and courage of its leaders, headed by Major Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Communist party of Cuba."

He visualized "the two great currents of world revolution" attending the conference -- the one "born in 1917 with the great

October Revolution, and that which represents the anti-imperialist and national liberation movements."

Ben Barka added: "It is historic that this conference will take place in Cuba, because the Cuban Revolution is the realization of these two currents."

### SCANDAL GROWS IN BEN BARKA CASE

By George Saunders

Continuing sensational revelations in the Ben Barka case and the very suspicious death of a key witness, Georges Figon, have blown up a crisis of major proportions for the de Gaulle government. The scandal promises to rank with the Dreyfus affair in its revelations of complicity in high places. And it recalls the Stavisky affair in the 1930's -- a scandal involving government corruption that shook France and became one of the preludes to a big leftward shift in the political arena.

The extent of the pressure on de Gaulle can be seen in his issuing of international warrants for the arrest of Moroccan Interior Minister Gen. Mohammed Oufkir and two of Oufkir's aides. France has recalled its ambassador and threatens to apply economic and financial sanctions if Morocco does submit these officials to judgment by the French criminal courts.

De Gaulle has gone to great lengths in a transparent attempt to shift the onus of this major scandal onto Morocco and get the heat off his own government. Undoubtedly, the sinister Oufkir, who is said to work closely with the CIA, played a key role in the kidnapping and apparent murder of the Moroccan socialist leader. But the evidence indicates that very high officials in the French government played an equally important part.

Recent testimony has linked a number of French agencies or officials to the crime:

A Major Le Roy was fired from his post as a secret service officer in the Department of Alien Documentation and Counter-espionage for not reporting to his superiors on the kidnapping. Le Roy then testified that the head of another department knew even more about the kidnapping than he did. He referred to the General Information Bureau (BGI), which is directly responsible to de Gaulle's interior minister, Roger Frey.

A subordinate of Le Roy's in the Department of Alien Documentation and Counterespionage, Antoine Lopez, was one of the kidnapers. He testified that Jacques Foccart, one of de Gaulle's closest aides, was kept informed of the plans for the kidnapping. Foccart is de Gaulle's presidential staff secretary; he also advises de Gaulle on -- African affairs!

The weekly news magazine L'Express printed an "eyewitness account" of the crime by Georges Figon. Figon was in position to give an authentic account as he was one of the kidnapers. L'Express printed a second statement by Figon in its January 24 issue. This statement was said to have been made by Figon three hours before his death from a bullet wound said by the police to have been self-inflicted.

Figon charged that a Gaullist deputy, Pierre Lemarchand, was involved in the crime. Lemarchand and Jean Caille, head of the political department of the Paris police, heard a report by Figon immediately after the kidnapping, according to the kidnapper.

Figon intimated that Lemarchand and Caille might have been inspirers of the crime. Both men had served earlier in a Gaullist underground organization, the "Barbouzes." Lemarchand is a close friend of de Gaulle's interior minister, Roger Frey, who at one time headed the "Barbouzes."

Figon's untimely death is being investigated. It is the center of furor in the press. For two months after the kidnapping, Figon roamed Paris freely although a warrant was out for his arrest in connection with the investigation of Ben Barka's disappearance. Reporters interviewed Figon and took photographs of him; the police, strangely, couldn't find him. At least that is what they claimed.

Then when they finally did locate the fugitive, they were again disappointed. Figon shot himself just as they entered his apartment. At least that is what they reported.

To make the case all the more mysterious, the fingerprints on the death weapon were ruled "not usable" for identification. No one doubts the fact, however, that Figon was killed by a gun held at close range.

#### AVOWED TROTSKYIST AMONG DEFENDANTS IN WARSAW COURT

Last May a Warsaw court sentenced two youths to prison. Karol Modzelewski was given a three-and-a-half-year sentence, Jacek Kuron three years. The case attracted international attention in view of the fact that the crime involved was political dissidence with the Gomulka regime and Karol Modzelewski was the son of Zygmunt Modzelewski, Foreign Minister in the Polish government from 1947 to 1951.

The young rebels were opponents of capitalism and firm believers in communism. Their difference with the regime was over such issues as the right to discuss freely.

Apparently their views reflected rather widespread senti-



ments among student circles. A group had formed around these leaders and documents had been circulated...

Since their imprisonment, little news has appeared about them. Recently the Paris weekly Nouvel Observateur referred to them in an article signed by Claude Roy, who visited Poland not long ago. His snide remarks about "visionaries" and "lunatics" reflect the official view of the bureaucrats, who are so fearful of political dissent that they will not permit even madmen to voice it.

Another case connected with this one, but involving an avowed Trotskyist, ended recently in Warsaw. The press has maintained almost complete silence about it. The following brief account, now circulating in Warsaw, has become available to World Outlook:

"Along with Modzelewski and Kuron, four other persons were arrested. Their cases were handled separately. Besides their political positions, they were accused of having connections abroad, which they denied.

"The four defended their positions very firmly. One of the men arrested with them, Ludwig Haas, was put on the witness stand. At the time of the entry of the Soviet troops in Poland, he was arrested as a Trotskyist and deported for more than fifteen years. As a witness, he personally defended the Trotskyist point of view.

"The defendants and the witness gave the old Communist salute, fists clenched.

"When the verdict was handed down, the defendants sang the International. That's certainly the first time since the end of the war that the proletarian hymn has been sung voluntarily in Poland. People in the courtroom joined the defendants in singing and likewise gave the clenched fist salute. Afterward they suffered some reprisals."

On January 13 the Associated Press put the following few lines from Warsaw on its wire services:

"Three intellectuals have been sentenced to three years in prison by a Warsaw court for having circulated tracts advocating overturning the Communist régime. Those involved are the historians Ludwig Haas and Romuald Smiech and the economist Kasimierz Badowski."

RELATIVE QUIESCENCE ON WITCH-HUNT FRONT IN U.S.

By George Novack

There has been some apprehension among defenders of democratic rights, both in the United States and abroad, that the rising opposition among the American people to involvement in the Vietnamese civil war will call forth a resurgence of McCarthyism. This is not a groundless danger and it may come at a later point in the conflict. But up to now surprisingly little steam has been generated by the witch-hunting patrioteers.

If the powers that be had been disposed to launch another rabid offensive against American radicalism; they deliberately passed up a ready-made pretext for that purpose when Kennedy was killed in November 1963. The circumstances surrounding the assassination of the American president contained all the ingredients necessary for a frame-up in which the supporters of the Soviet Union and the Cuban Revolution might have been pinned with "political and moral responsibility" for the deed.

Instead, the State Department, either for reasons of foreign policy or for fear of unleashing emotions with incalculable and uncontrollable consequences at home, decided only two hours after the shooting in Dallas to head off and soft-pedal charges that agents of Castroism and Communism were behind the affair. The news media were advised to describe it as the act of a lone individual. Ultraright efforts to whip up lynch sentiment against the "reds" fell flat.

So far, official quarters have been rather restrained in their attitude toward the antiwar forces. It is well known that all the radical tendencies participate in one or another sector of the opposition to the "dirty war" in Vietnam. Except for the moderate liberal-pacifist wing headed by Sane (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy), the antiwar organizations practice nonexclusion as to membership and admit all groups and individuals regardless of political beliefs or affiliations.

The three-man delegation which visited Prague, Moscow, Peking and Hanoi during the bombing pause to seek clarification on the negotiation issue included Herbert Aptheker, the foremost Communist party theoretician. The other two were Staughton Lynd, professor of history at Yale university and Thomas Hayden, one of the founders of the Students for a Democratic Society. Although Yale alumni sought to have Lynd dismissed from his job; and possible indictments on several counts hang over their heads, the trio were not virulently red-baited upon their return.

The pro-Moscow Communists, relieved by a recent ruling of the Supreme Court that the party and its members are not required to register or incur extreme penalties because of their views or

political ties, have been more active publicly than at any time since the start of the Korean War in 1950.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of America's secret political police, the FBI, issues periodic warnings about the menace of "Communism" and his stool pigeons file their reports regularly while the Legionnaires, John Birchers and other ultraright voices join the chorus. But the herd of red-baiters have not been summoned into action on cue from above. The House Un-American Activities Committee has yet to hold inquisitorial hearings against the current student or adult leaders of the antiwar forces, though it can be counted on to do so at a propitious moment.

There are numerous reasons for this sluggishness in resorting to witch-hunting tactics. The experience with McCarthyism is vividly remembered and hangs heavy upon the consciences of many Americans, especially in the intellectual community. They feel that this shameful episode should not be repeated and are quite sensitive to the more flagrant moves in that direction.

For example, more than 1,200 professors in colleges from coast to coast have signed as sponsors of the national committee defending the three Young Socialist Alliance members at the University of Indiana indicted under an anti-Communist state law almost three years ago.

The U.S. has never been so prosperous; and an official recrudescence of witch-hunting would mar the image of the Johnsonian "consensus" in the ballyhooed "Great Society." While the Negroes are on the march and manifestly discontented, organized labor remains relatively passive. Although outbreaks in the black ghettos, like the one in Watts, are put down by force, the demands of the more than 20,000,000 Negroes are so justified and popular that they cannot be stigmatized or dismissed as inspired by Moscow, Peking or Havana. Since the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee has come out against the Vietnam war, attempts are being made to smear this militant Southern youth civil-rights organization with a red brush, though not with much effect.

It would not be difficult to try to pin the label of "Commie traitor" upon other prominent participants in the antiwar movement by arguing that their indictments of Washington's aggression and their calls for withdrawal of U.S. troops are sapping morale and helping the "Vietcong" and north Vietnam to win.

The main obstacle here is the unprecedented questioning of Johnson's course in Southeast Asia at home as well as abroad. Many doubters about the wisdom of his policies are to be found in all walks of American life. These range from radical students and intellectuals on the left to influential members of Congress and political commentators of such prominence as Walter Lippmann and James Reston, one of the editorial writers of the influential New York Times.

If the administration should start branding its more outspoken opponents as "Communist agitators" or "dupes," where will it draw the line? Johnson is well aware of the extraordinary extent of this criticism and the Pandora's box that might be opened once the lid were lifted on the witch-hunters and war hawks.

Finally -- and this is a most persuasive consideration for practical Democratic and Republican politicians -- uninhibited witch-hunting does not pay off in votes at the polls as it did in the fifties. McCarthyism, which propelled Nixon into the vice-presidency, is no longer the easiest road to electoral success. This has recently been tested in two significant national and state races.

Goldwater ran against Johnson in 1964 on an anticivil-rights, antilabor and anti-Communist line. He was buried on election day.

In the November 1965 election in the Eastern industrial state of New Jersey, the Republican candidate Dumont sought to oust the incumbent Democratic Governor Hughes by campaigning on a single issue involving red-baiting. Gov. Hughes had refused to request the state university of Rutgers to fire Eugene Genovese, a history professor who had proclaimed his solidarity with the south Vietnamese revolutionists at a teach-in. The Republican assailant of academic freedom went down to overwhelming defeat in a contest whose outcome was carefully watched by politicians all over the country.

The repressive laws and witch-hunting machinery remain intact on national, state and local levels; and, when need requires, these are set into motion against dissenters and radicals of every description. Pacifist burners of draft cards have been indicted. Because of his political ideas and activities, Joseph Johnson, Minneapolis organizer of the Socialist Workers party, has been ordered to deport himself from the United States where he is a native-born citizen. The cases of the young people who organized a trip in defiance of the State Department's ban on travel to Cuba is still in the courts and they are now even prohibited from moving about freely in their own country. William Epton, Negro leader of the Maoist Progressive Labor Movement, has just been framed up and found guilty of violating a rarely used criminal anarchy statute of the state of New York for his role in the 1964 Harlem outburst.

Such victimizations can be stepped up as the Vietnam war and the opposition to it escalate. However, the power centers of the capitalist ruling class have not been promoting a concerted campaign on the McCarthyite pattern. Such measures are being held in reserve for a different turn of events.

On the Index Librorum Prohibitorum

NKRUMAH'S BOOK ANGERS STATE DEPARTMENT

When Kwame Nkrumah's latest book, Neocolonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism, was published in England last November, it caused a furor in Washington.

Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams summoned the Ghanaian Ambassador to "most forcefully protest" its publication. He took umbrage at what he termed the "completely unwarranted charges against the United States" made by the head of the Ghanaian government in his book.

The State Department decided that this sharp diplomatic action was not enough. The whole population of Ghana must be made to suffer. Two days after the protest was lodged, the Ghanaian Foreign Ministry was informed that the United States had rejected a request from Ghana for \$127,000,000 in surplus food over the next seven years.

When given an opportunity by reporters to deny that this act was in retaliation for the publication of the book, the State Department spokesman replied with a "no comment."

Probably the worst offense committed by Nkrumah, as weighed on the State Department scales, is the exposure of how U.S. finance capital operates in Africa and how it is helped by such agencies as the Peace Corps, the United States Information Agency, and the officialdom of the AFL-CIO.

Nkrumah's book has now been scheduled for publication in the U.S. It should enjoy brisk sales -- as is the case with most books listed by reaction as prohibited reading.

THE SITUATION IN LATIN AMERICA

(The following survey of the current situation in key sectors of Latin America has been translated from the December 29 issue of La Verdad, weekly newspaper of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores.)

\* \* \*

In Brazil, the most important country of Latin America, the "gorilla" government of Castelo Branco has achieved relative stabilization. It has succeeded not only in almost completely crushing the mass movement and gaining relative economic stability, it has also taken considerable steps toward establishment of a new political equilibrium among the ruling classes.

This stands out all the more clearly in light of the success of the Castelo Branco government in absorbing a big electoral defeat in the most important states; establishing a "Second Institutional Act"; turning over the governorship of the State of Guanabara to someone in the entourage of the proscribed ex-president Kubitschek; and, finally, repressing the intransigent "gorilla" wing of the army swayed by Lacerda. It has absorbed all this without immediately endangering its stability.

This shrewd policy of "permanent zigzag" maintained by the Castelo Branco government has a key aim: to forge an imposing political united front of the big majority of Brazil's exploiting classes around an agreement between "Casteloism" and "Juscelism" (the followers of Juscelino Kubitschek), supported directly by the armed forces and U.S. diplomacy. Hence the whole policy of the government is to differentiate itself on the one hand from the intransigent "gorillas" who stand in the way of an agreement with the Kubitschek wing of the bourgeoisie; and on the other hand to definitively separate "Juscelism" from "Brizzolaism," the nationalist wing of the Brazilian bourgeoisie.

The fact that the Brazilian government has not yet established this balance determines the unstable character of the political situation in the country. But until the mass movement is again on the rise or until the chronic crisis of the economy becomes aggravated, the regime will continue to be the most stable element in maintaining the new Latin-American policy of the State Department. And the big majority of the Latin-American bourgeois governments will find themselves obliged to accept the Brazilian pattern of "democracy."

This general situation has been of particular importance in Venezuela. In 1965 the FLN (Frente de Liberacion Nacional) underwent a rupture; i.e., the agreement between the Communist party, the MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria) and minor groups around maintaining armed struggle and guerrilla war as the axis of political opposition to "Betancourtism" came to an end.

The majority of the Communist party oriented toward an agreement with the "broadly based" government of President Leoni, in fact sabotaging the guerrilla struggle. The right wing of the MIR led by Rangel broke with the organization, arguing for the necessity of ending the armed struggle.

This situation occurs against the background of a continued recession of the mass movement and the pinning down of the guerrilla fighters -- now practically autonomous with regard to the FLN -- in isolated zones of the coastal mountains.

On the diplomatic front, imperialism has taken advantage of this situation to continue advancing. It succeeded in getting the OAS (Organization of American States) to legalize its inter-

vention in Santo Domingo and the majority of the national bourgeoisies to accept the declaration of the House of Representatives proclaiming the right of the United States to intervene unilaterally in any country of the continent whenever the president so decides.

Finally, toward the end of the year, it succeeded in opening discussion on an Inter-American Force, although without driving for a vote which could touch off new squabbles with countries traditionally opposed to this solution, particularly Mexico and Chile. This advance of the U.S. within the OAS was made possible by the Brazilian situation indicated above and by the role played by Argentine diplomacy, which has supported the U.S. in all the fundamental problems.

Nevertheless, this general pattern of ebb is highly unequal and contradictory. In Colombia and Guatemala, peasant guerrilla forces have become consolidated, and the program and conceptions of the Guatemalan guerrilla movement, directly inspired by the method advocated by Hugo Blanco and the Peruvian FIR (Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario), has developed as a new political pole of attraction for the entire Latin-American guerrilla vanguard. The extreme weakness to which the guerrilla fighters of Venezuela and Peru have been reduced, a result of their dependence on non-Leninist petty-bourgeois leaderships, can become converted into a strength, into the beginning of a critical process that will bring these self-sacrificing fighters to understand the necessity of transcending the unilateral theory of a guerrilla "focal center," and adopting the Leninist-Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution and the armed mobilization of the masses.

In Bolivia, despite the consolidation of the semifascist Barrientos regime, the deportation and murder of leaders of the masses, and the intervention of the trade-union organizations, the military dictatorship has not succeeded in imposing an outright fascist regime.

In the mines the proletariat have continued to resist, boycotting the trade-union elections arranged by the Military Junta, organizing demonstrations and marches, organizing local strikes, defending themselves in innumerable cases arms in hand and succeeding in achieving such an important victory as regaining the previous wage level.

The student movement has continued to develop in a radical direction, orienting increasingly toward a revolutionary perspective. Its role has been fundamental in the struggle against the Military Junta in the cities. It has kept up continual agitation, organizing the struggle to defend the prisoners and win their freedom, and initiating many other forms of struggle.

All this indicates that at any moment the situation can turn, the offensive being resumed by the mass movement, bringing

about a prerevolutionary situation. But this requires the reorganization of the workers movement from the bottom up. That is the fundamental role cast for the Partido Obrero Revolucionario in view of its tradition and the respect it enjoys among the Bolivian masses.

In the Dominican Republic the situation is comparable. Here, too, the counterrevolution won a considerable political victory with the establishment of the Garcia Godoy government and the disarming of the "Constitutionalist" army. But, unlike Bolivia, this situation up to now has not signified a major defeat for the masses. On the contrary, from the very beginning of the "Constitutionalist" uprising, the masses have been going through immense experiences and developing their political understanding.

It appears that the Dominican proletariat is playing a more and more determining role, superseding the plebeian petty bourgeoisie of the cities who up to now constituted the fundamental yeast and "rebel" social base. Toward the end of the year, the Dominican situation was tending to become more radicalized, strengthening the mass movement. The present situation in the country is such that only the Yankee armed forces can guarantee continuation of the bourgeois state.

During the second half of 1965, the chronic structural crisis in Uruguay, expressed in an uncontrollable inflationary process undermining the fiscal stability of the national state, exploded in a series of big mobilizations of state employees. These mobilizations became extended into the workers movement as a whole and, toward the end of the year, continued to spiral, leaving the government at wit's end on how to meet it.

The chronic structural crisis and the rise of the proletariat operate toward giving a prerevolutionary character to the situation in Uruguay. Only the political level of the Uruguayan wage workers, expressed in the lack of a revolutionary party, makes a change in the situation of slow duration.

#### SNEEVLIET -- MARXIST MISSIONARY IN INDONESIA

By Jan Hekkenberg

(The following article appeared in the November 1965 issue of the New Zealand Monthly Review. In gathering his material, the author was assisted by Sneevliet's widow before her death last year. Writing about her husband, Mrs. Sneevliet told Jan Hekkenberg: "Our principle still lives on, this I agreed with my husband when we parted.")

\* \* \*

At 9 p.m. on Sunday 12 April 1942 seven death row cells of the German concentration camp at Amersfoort in Holland were thrown



open. Extra guards were posted and a call went out: 'There are dangerous people coming'. Then Sneevliet's voice was heard by a prisoner who was later granted a reprieve: 'Men, we are proud to be the first in Holland to die for the sake of the International'.

The lights were switched on every 15 minutes. Dutch S.S. guards patrolled the outside walls, using torches. The next morning the seven prisoners, members of the outlawed Marx-Lenin-Luxemburg Front, were brought together in a 7 x 3 foot cell and told that the death sentence would be carried out shortly. Permission to die without being blindfolded was given. Sneevliet, the leader of the resistance group, asked for the right to be executed last.

The condemned men were given cigars and Sneevliet spoke again: 'I suffered my Gethsemane last night. When I was a boy and joined the socialist movement the priest said to me: "My boy, you may go your way, as long as you keep your faith." I have fought and kept the faith. Faith in the International. There will be much more suffering and struggle, but the future will be ours.'

Sneevliet referred to some of his experiences in Indonesia, then the men joined hands and together they sang the International. 'I never heard voices singing with so much sentiment and emotion, I was not ashamed to cry,' wrote the fellow prisoner.

Later one of the condemned men asked for silence and a Catholic prayer was recited. There was a moment of absolute silence. Then the prisoners were put in a car and at twenty minutes past nine the first shots were heard. Farewelling his relatives Sneevliet had written: 'I hope to live up to the Indonesian motto: Berani Karena Benar -- Be brave, because it is good.'

\* \* \*

Henricus (Henk) J. F. M. Sneevliet was born at Rotterdam in 1883. His mother died young, leaving her son to the care of relatives. The Sneevliets were Catholics, but Henk left the Church after he completed Grammar School and became a railway employee. As a boy he had seen much poverty for which the Church showed no concern, but he developed no bitterness: 'I did not lose the poetry and splendour of the joyful Catholic faith without acquiring the riches and religious fervour of a belief in Social Democracy', he stated on one occasion. Perhaps Sneevliet's loyalties remained Catholic, if only in a human sense.

Before the first world war Sneevliet became a trade union leader and in 1913, after a dispute about Revisionism in the socialist movement, he left for Indonesia where a Dutch novelist, known for her deep concern about colonial conditions had arranged a position for him.

The failure of Revisionist Socialism in 1914 and the picture of colonial capitalism at work caused Sneevliet's political creed to mature. 'I realized in Indonesia that I shared the beliefs of

Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin, Trotsky and others,' he wrote.

There were two nationalist movements in Indonesia in 1914, the Budi Utomo and the Sarekat Islam. Both of these were mainly concerned with cultural and economic affairs, partly for security reasons. Resentment against oppression and widespread poverty existed, but it did not yet express itself in any well defined social and political form. Sneevliet observed the situation and when he became editor of a European railway employees journal he made a move to extend union membership to Indonesians. Many European members resigned, but with Indonesian membership the union became strong and later played a part in the nationalist movement.

In 1914 and upon Sneevliet's initiative a number of Dutch Social Democrats formed the Indies Social Democrat Association (I.S.D.V.) with a weekly edited by himself and Baars, another Marxist Dutchman.

Sneevliet now started to advocate the liberation of Indonesia through the organization and struggle of the peasants together with the newly formed working class. He emphasized the need for opposing both national and foreign capitalism and hammered the point that European socialists had nothing in common with the foreign imperialists in Indonesia. This was powerful stuff in the Dutch East Indies at that time, even for the Javanese who listened to Sneevliet's fiery speeches at mass gatherings. The reaction of one newspaper, perhaps the first known Indonesian response to the Marxist gospel, was as follows:

'Only seldom have we heard somebody who testified so beautifully, so sensitively, so much from the bottom of his heart of a belief founded on prolonged study, as Mr. Sneevliet did yesterday. For two hours he managed to captivate his audience in an atmosphere of breathless silence. We know that this socialist, anti-government and anti-employer address deeply impressed the young Javanese who nevertheless did not dare to express their appreciation by a loud applause.'

Sneevliet's I.S.D.V. soon attracted a number of capable and intelligent Indonesians like Semaun, Tan Malakka and Darsono, all of later and still of present fame. They began to influence the existing nationalist organizations towards a leftist course. New trade unions were also formed. On 18th March 1917 word arrived that the Russian February Revolution had broken out and Sneevliet wrote:

'Can the glad tidings also be heard in the towns and villages of this part of the world?

'Here lives a nation incomparably blessed by nature.'

'Here lives a nation that is needy and illiterate.

'Here lives a nation producing riches which for centuries have flowed into the coffers of Western Europe.

'Here lives a population which endures and suffers.

'People of Java, the Russian Revolution also contains lessons for you. The Russian people too suffered ages of oppression and were poor and largely illiterate, like yourselves.

'They triumphed only by constant struggle.

'Serving the cause of freedom is a heavy responsibility. It demands the whole personality and courage, above all courage.

'Will those responsible for the distribution of material for an Indonesian radical political and economic movement now double their efforts?

'And continue to work relentlessly, even if much seed is falling on the rocks and stones?

'Only then will the Indonesian people find what the Russian people have found: Victory for their cause....'

The Dutch colonial authorities who had been remarkably tolerant, or perhaps just careless towards Sneevliet and his works, now started legal proceedings against him. A trial was held in Semarang at which Sneevliet defended himself with great confidence. Altogether he spoke for nine hours, attacking the colonial system in a way that made it seem, according to one Dutch newspaper, as if the roles of the accused and the prosecution were reversed. The speeches were later published in the bookform.

The Judge showed a liberal dislike for a political trial and the prosecution had shown political ignorance and so Sneevliet was acquitted. Outside the Courthouse a huge crowd of Indonesians welcomed him and by request of the police he climbed a lamppost to address the multitude.

Towards the end of the first world war the moderate wing in the Dutch Social Democrat Party gained more influence and this in turn affected the I.S.D.V. in Indonesia which was mainly Sneevliet's creation. A large number of European members resigned to form a separate organization and so the I.S.D.V. became almost entirely an Indonesian group. The next development followed in 1920 when it became the P.K.I., the Indonesian Communist Party. It is significant that Sneevliet's original Indonesian converts left the party in various ways.

Sneevliet's career in Indonesia came to an end in 1918. He

had become active in organizations for the lower (Dutch and Indonesian) ranks of the army and navy. On a May Day gathering he addressed a large number of sailors as: 'Fellow party members, friends, Red Guard of the fleet'. According to the interpretation of one newspaper this meant that Sneevliet was convinced that 'almost the entire fleet was on his side!'

It was probably an exaggeration, but the colonial authorities now decided to remove Sneevliet. Twice he received visits from an agent-provocateur -- a navy officer seeking support for a rebellion -- and the head of the political information service also called, pointing out, in a most reasonable manner, that Sneevliet's followers could easily get out of hand. Towards the end of 1918 an expulsion order was issued and he left the country, farewelled like no Dutchman had ever been farewelled before.

Nor was Sneevliet forgotten after his departure from Indonesia. He became the delegate for the P.K.I. at the Second Congress of the Comintern where Lenin appointed him as Secretary of the Commission on Colonial Problems in the Far East. His Indonesian friends kept in touch with him even from as far as the notorious Dutch concentration camp Tanah Merah in New Guinea. And, as Arnold Brackman has observed in his exhaustive study of Indonesian Communism, since the days of Sneevliet Marxist-Nationalist sentiment has permeated the Indonesian independence movement.

There is no space to discuss Sneevliet's further activities extensively here, but it may be interesting to note that as a Comintern representative he was active in China where he met Sun Yat Sen and assisted the reluctant Chinese communists to establish relations with the Kuomintang. In 1923 Sneevliet resigned from the Comintern and later became a Trotskyist Member of Parliament. In close association with Trotsky during the thirties, he was to receive attention from Stalin's secret police who were responsible for the murder of two prominent Trotskyists in Sneevliet's surroundings.

A few days after the German occupation of Holland in 1940 the German police called at Sneevliet's home in Amsterdam. He escaped and was soon busy with the formation of an underground political resistance group, the Marx-Lenin-Luxemburg Front. The M.L.L.F. published a fortnightly bulletin, ran a youth movement, distributed anti-Nazi pamphlets among the German occupation forces and established contacts with Marxist groups in Belgium and in Germany itself.

The invasion of Russia in 1941 caused a wave of arrests in Holland and a number of M.L.L.F. members were also caught. A second series of arrests early in 1942 hit the organization seriously and Sneevliet fled south. It was too late; during a wild and stormy night both he and his wife (who was to survive the Ravensbruck concentration camp) were arrested near the Belgian frontier.

Along with others Sneevliet was tried and sentenced to death. According to his Dutch Counsel (allocated when the trial had already started) he defended himself with sound arguments in excellent German. The trial revolved around Sneevliet and there were times when the Court showed respect for his stand. The summary of the trial shows a Teutonic thoroughness in its understanding of the resistance group.

'It belongs to the communist groups which seek to overthrow, on an international basis, the existing governments and desire to establish a working class government according to the ideas of Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg. As a communist party of a Trotskyist nature it (the M.L.L.F.) regards the leadership of Stalin as a betrayal of the party programme drawn up by Lenin and sees itself in a sense carrying out the will of Lenin, by seeking a solution to the international problems through a "Fourth International".

'Sneevliet's political career from a minor trade union secretary to Comintern Representative in the Far East, in the Dutch East Indies and in China, as well as his personal links with Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin indicate that he is a high, fanatical and skilled communist functionary whose activities against the state have been proved beyond doubt by the measures taken against him by the police authorities of a number of countries.'

'He was fully conscious of the punishment which his stand would bring. He takes the view that sacrifices are part of the political struggle and that he is prepared, if necessary, to die for his political beliefs.'

In a moving last letter to his wife Sneevliet wrote about his life struggle:

'It did not bring riches or fame, such is the fate of those who do not regard the world of today and tomorrow as all important and who under all circumstances think of a future in which norms of high quality will govern the relations between man and man. For us world peace and brotherhood have never been concepts incapable of realization.'

And in tribute to Henk Sneevliet in 1953 John McNair of the British I.L.P. speaks of his knowledge of languages, literature and socialism which Sneevliet always regarded as absolutely irreconcilable with any form of totalitarian government. John McNair recollects how Sneevliet, better than most, understood the ramifications of American monopoly capitalism and believed that the planning of a socialist society had to be carried out in an atmosphere of freedom. Sneevliet, according to John McNair who knew him well between the world wars, regarded the socialist as the only true individualist whose attacks on any form of bureaucracy are based on his unalterable belief in the development of the human personality.

'He showed himself the friend whom we knew, respected and loved. For him it was impossible to sell or surrender his principles, he was prepared to die for them. His name will live on in the history of socialist thinking as a source of lasting inspiration and the effect of his labours and his personality will be continued in the history of the human race.'

'Enter into the ruling principle of your neighbour's mind and suffer him to enter into yours', suggested Marcus Aurelius 1800 years ago and this advice may still be useful today for a better understanding of Indonesia where even anti-communists interpret the West (including the Malaysia issue) in Marxist terms. The story of Marxism in Indonesia starts with Henk Sneevliet who was its first missionary and martyr.

#### References

Voor Vrijheid en Socialisme (For Freedom and Socialism). Edited by M. Perthuis for the Sneevliet Commemoration Committee. A series of articles in bookform privately published in Rotterdam (1953).

Indonesian Communism -- A History, Arnold C. Brackman, Frederick A. Praeger, New York and London, 1963.

Sneevliet's archives have been deposited in the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam. There are also 185 letters and documents concerning Henk Sneevliet in the Library of Harvard University, belonging to the closed section of the Trotsky archives which may be made available in 1980. It is unlikely that these refer to Sneevliet's Indonesian period.

The Prophet Outcast, Isaac Deutscher, O.U.P. Vol. 3 of Trotsky's biography. Contains a number of interesting references to Sneevliet.

#### THE EXAMPLE OF CUBA

By Bertrand Russell

(The following is the text of a statement by Bertrand Russell which was tape-recorded for Havana Radio. The world-famous philosopher had sent a message of greetings to the Tricontinental Conference. The Cuban government was so pleased with this that they asked for a tape-recorded message.)

\* \* \*

Throughout the world, people speak in awe and admiration of the extraordinary spirit of the Cuban people. In the course of

history, there have been many cruel and predatory imperialisms, but few have been as powerful as United States imperialism. In Cuba, a small nation has defied successfully this great colossus.

I need not tell you of the impact your revolution has made on the consciousness of all those suffering from exploitation and domination. There is no other country in Latin America where the wealth and resources of the population are not manipulated and stolen by foreign capitalists whose base of operation is the United States.

The problem, therefore, that presents itself to the people of the world is how to remove the rulers of the United States, who have created a war machine of great brutality to protect their economic empire.

In Vietnam and the Dominican Republic the rulers of U.S. capitalism have sought directly to suppress popular and patriotic struggle. But the problem is not only one of military aggression. U.S. rulers also control world markets, and through this they siphon the wealth of people and make them ever more dependent on the United States. When we consider the suffering this causes, we are again reminded of the debt we owe to the Cuban people for showing us the way to overcome misery and degradation.

Let us examine the nature of this war machine. Three thousand military bases and vast mobile fleets, bearing missiles and fleets of nuclear bombers, are spread over our planet to protect the ownership and control by U.S. capitalism of sixty per cent of the world's resources. Sixty per cent of the world's resources are owned by the rulers of six per cent of the world's population.

The aggressiveness of this empire imposes on mankind an expenditure of \$140,000,000,000 annually or \$16,000,000 each hour. The current arms expenditure exceeds the entire national income of all developing countries. It exceeds the world's annual exports of all commodities. It exceeds the national income of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The U.S. military budget is nearly \$60,000,000,000 per year. One Atlas missile costs \$30,000,000 or the equivalent of the total investment for nitrogen fertilizer plant with capacity of 70,000 tons per annum.

Consider this in terms of the United Kingdom only, to take the example of a prosperous country: one obsolete missile equals four universities, one TSR-2 equals five modern hospitals, one ground-to-air missile equals 100,000 tractors.

During the past fourteen years the U.S. spent \$4,000,000,000 to purchase farm surpluses; butter and cheese have been stored and poisoned to keep prices up in the world markets. Blue dye is poured into great mountains of butter and cheese to render them unusable. By 1960, 125,000,000 tons of bread grain had been

stored in the United States to rot -- enough food for every citizen of India for one year. Unimaginably vast quantities of food-stuffs are calculatedly destroyed by the rulers of U.S. capitalism for no other purpose than the continuation of their profits and the retention of their power. Like vultures the handful of the rich batten on the poor, the exploited, the oppressed.

A drop of five per cent in the world price of staple exports of any country would, according to Dag Hammarskjold, wipe out all investments of the world bank, of the United Nations and all bilateral and other investments. These were the fears of Hammarskjold. What are the facts? In recent years prices have been operated against poor countries not merely at five per cent but at forty per cent.

The industrial production of Western capitalism is consciously employed not only to perpetuate the hunger which exists in the world, but to increase it vastly for profit. In South Africa, 10,000 children die annually from gastroenteritis. The smallpox which haunts many countries could be eliminated at a cost of \$500,000. Hundreds of millions who suffer from yaws could be cured by a five-penny shot of penicillin. Five hundred million people have trachoma. Sixty per cent of the children of Africa suffer from protein-deficiency diseases such as kwashiorkor, beriberi or pellagra.

When U.S. capitalists hoard food and poison it, they not only deprive the starving, but force the developing countries to buy food at high costs. The riches of the earth are destroyed, wasted, stolen by the few and used to murder the millions.

But the people of Cuba have stirred the conscience of the American people. Every university, school and, indeed, every major city in the United States witnesses the popular resistance of the American people to the military-industrial complex which rules them. This new resistance of the people of the United States is a tribute to the people of Cuba, because the demands of the American resistance are precisely those which have been achieved, in practice, in Cuba. As the people of the United States become more militant and strong in their opposition, and as the peoples of the world follow the Cuban example, the predatory system which so jeopardizes world peace will succumb to the people of the United States and the world.

I sent you my warmest greetings in our common struggle.